

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,599,050 to Sjöö (“Sjöö”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,146,060 to Rydberg et al. (“Rydberg”).

The Information Disclosure Statement

It is requested that the Examiner indicate consideration of the references cited in the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 10, 2003 by returning a copy of the corresponding initialed PTO Form 1449 to Applicants. Please note that this is the third such request.

The Claim of Priority

Applicants request that in the next Office communication, the Examiner acknowledge receipt of the certified copies of priority documents Swedish Patent Application No. 0203356-1, filed in the U.S.P.T.O. on November 2, 2004, and Swedish Patent Application No. 0202029-5, filed in the U.S.P.T.O. on February 7, 2006. Please note that this also is the third such request.

All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sjöö in view of Rydberg, commonly owned by the assignee of the instant application. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 1 recites an apparatus for chip removing machining, including a first part and a second part coupled together by a coupling. The coupling includes two interacting surfaces and a clamping member for forcing the surfaces together. The interacting surfaces are profiled with male and female members, respectively that are intercoupled to establish a firm locking of the first and second parts against each other. The first and the second parts are provided with aligned holes for receiving the clamping member. The male and the female members are oriented on the interacting surfaces such that the male and female members intercouple only in a single position, the orientation of the male and female members prevents the male and female members from intercoupling in another position.

At page 3, the Office Action acknowledges that “Sjöö lacks the disclosure of the male and the female members being oriented on the interacting surfaces such that the male and female members intercouple only in a single position and the orientation of the male and female members prevents the male and female members from intercoupling in another position.”

The Office Action goes on to rely on Rydberg, in particular Figs. 2a-2c, to overcome the deficiencies of Sjöö. Turning first to the Abstract of Rydberg, the Rydberg tool includes a cutting head and a holder, the cutting head and the holder form two cooperating surfaces that are pressed together. The cooperating surfaces allow at least four separate relative positions between the cutting head and holder. The Detailed Description of Rydberg goes on to describe that Figs.

2A to 2D show a tool 10 including a holder 11, a cutting head 12 and a screw 13. One end of the holder 11 includes a front surface 14 and a threaded hole 15. The front surface 14 has a circular basic shape and includes first and second rows of grooves 16B, 16A. See col. 4, ll. 27-36 of Rydberg. As described at col. 5, ll. 9-10, and illustrated in Fig. 2A, pyramid shaped projections P are formed when the second groove row 16A intersects the first groove row 16B. As described at col. 5, ll. 20-38, and illustrated in Fig. 2B, cutting head 12 includes a support surface 22 having a waffle pattern thereon. As described at col. 6, ll. 5-7, “the milling tool 10 is mounted by manually placing the support surface 22 of the cutting head 12 against the front surface 14 of the holder 11 in one of four possible positions.” (emphasis added).

Thus, Applicants submit that Rydberg clearly does not show the features of “the male and the female members are oriented on the interacting surfaces such that the male and female members intercouple only in a single position, the orientation of the male and female members prevents the male and female members from intercoupling in another position,” as recited in claim 1.

Moreover, not only does each of Sjöö and Rydberg fail to disclose “the male and the female members are oriented on the interacting surfaces such that the male and female members intercouple only in a single position, the orientation of the male and female members prevents the male and female members from intercoupling in another position,” as recited in claim 1, each of Sjöö and Rydberg teach away from the male and female members intercoupling only in a single position.

Claims 2-7 depend from claim 1, and recite the same combination of allowable features recited in claim 1, as well as additional features that define over the prior art. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of claims 1-7, be withdrawn.

Claim 8 recites “the axially irregular surface profile adapted to be received in a corresponding axially irregular surface profile of the holder surface at a first angular position about the center axis with respect to the holder surface; wherein the surface profile of the head surface precludes reception thereof in the surface profile of the holder surface at all other angular positions about the axis such that the head surface and the holder surface intercouple only in a single position and no other position.”

Claim 9 recites “the axially irregular surface profile adapted to be received in a corresponding axially irregular surface profile of the head surface at a first angular position about the center axis with respect to the head surface; wherein the surface profile of the holder surface precludes reception thereof in the surface profile of the head surface at all other angular positions about the axis such that the holder surface and the head surface intercouple only in a single position and no other position.”

As described above, Sjöö and Rydberg disclose tool couplings including a holder and a cutting insert that may be connected with each other in multiple positions. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), of claims 8 and 9, be withdrawn.

Applicants submit that all pending claims, *i.e.* claims 1-9, are in condition for immediate allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully requests reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP



Peter J. Sistare
Reg. No. 48,183

Dated: August 21, 2007

By:

Customer No. 055694
DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465